

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 15-0107V
Filed: June 1, 2015
Unpublished

AARON PRIOR, *
*
Petitioner, * Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;
* Tetanus-diphtheria-pertussis ("Tdap")
v. * vaccine; Shoulder Injury Related to
* Vaccine Administration ("SIRVA");
* Special Processing Unit ("SPU")
SECRETARY OF HEALTH *
AND HUMAN SERVICES, *
*
Respondent. *

*Paul R. Brazil, Muller Brazil, LLP, Philadelphia, PA, for petitioner.
Sarah C. Duncan, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.*

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

Vowell, Chief Special Master:

On February 2, 2015, Aaron Prior filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² [the "Vaccine Act" or "Program"]. The petition alleges that as a result of a tetanus-diphtheria-pertussis ("Tdap") vaccination on March 31, 2014, petitioner suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration ("SIRVA"). Am. Pet. at preamble. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit ("SPU") of the Office of Special Masters.

On June 1, 2015, respondent filed her Rule 4(c) Report ["Respondent's Report"], in which she concedes that petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case.

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, it will be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, § 205, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (codified as amended at 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2006)). In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all "§" references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2006).

Respondent's Report at 4. Specifically, respondent "believes that petitioner's alleged injury is consistent [with a] SIRVA." *Id.* Respondent stated that "based on the record as it now stands, petitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the [Vaccine] Act." *Id.*

In view of respondent's concession and the evidence before me, I find that petitioner is entitled to compensation.

s/Denise K. Vowell

Denise K. Vowell
Chief Special Master